UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA OAKLAND DIVISION

United	States of America,)	Case No. CR 12-111 EMC
	Plaintiff, v.)))	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT APR 1 > 2012
Willia	em Wise,)	APR 1 7 20
	Defendant.)	NORTHERN U.S. D.W. W.
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on April 17, 2012, the Court excludes time and for the Speedy Trial Act from April 17, 2012 to May 23, 2012 and finds that the ends of justice says ed by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factor(s):			
	Failure to grant a continuance would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).		
	The case is so unusual or so complex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).		
	Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).		
	Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).		
Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).			
IT IS SO ORDERED.			
DATEI	D: <u>April</u> 17, 2012		LAUREL BEELER NANDOR J. VADAS United States Magistrate Judge
STIPU	LATED: Attorney for Defendant PAUL D. WOLF		Assistant United States Attorney TRACIE L. BROWN